

METRIC DIOPHANTINE APPROXIMATION OVER A LOCAL FIELD OF POSITIVE CHARACTERISTIC

ANISH GHOSH

ABSTRACT. We establish the conjectures of Sprindžhuk over a local field of positive characteristic. The method of Kleinbock-Margulis for the characteristic zero case is adapted.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we present a proof of the strong extremality of non-degenerate manifolds over a local field of positive characteristic.

1.1. Preliminary Notation. Let $\mathbb{F}$ denote the finite field of $k = p^\nu$ elements. Let $K = \mathbb{F}(X)$ be the ring of rational functions, $\mathcal{Z} = \mathbb{F}[X]$ the ring of polynomials, $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{F}[[X^{-1}]]$ be the ring of formal series in X^{-1} and $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{F}((X^{-1}))$ denote the field of Laurent series. A typical element of $\mathcal{K}$ is of the form

$$a = \sum_{i=-n}^{\infty} a_i X^{-i}, a_i \in \mathbb{F}, a_{-n} \neq 0.$$

It is well known that one can define a non-Archimedean valuation on $\mathcal{K}$ (the “valuation at ∞ ”):

$$v(a) = \sup\{j \in \mathbb{Z}, a_i = 0 \ \forall i < j\}$$

The corresponding discrete valuation ring is $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ is its quotient field. The valuation above leads to an absolute value $|a| = k^{-v(a)}$ which in turn induces a metric $d(a, b) = |a - b|$ and $(\mathcal{K}, d)$ is a separable, complete, ultrametric, totally disconnected space. Moreover, any local field of positive characteristic is isomorphic to some $\mathcal{K}$ (cf.[34]). We will extend the norm to vectors by defining $|\mathbf{x}| = \max_i |x_i|$. Vectors will be denoted in boldface, and we will use the notation $||$ for both vectors as well as elements of $\mathcal{K}$, relying on the context and typeface to make the distinction between the norms. The notation $|x|_+$ will stand for $\max(|x|, 1)$ and we will set $\Pi_+(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n |x_i|_+$. The notation $[]$ will be used to denote both the polynomial part of an element of $\mathcal{K}$ as well as the integer part of a real number. $B(\mathbf{x}, r)$ will denote the ball centered around $\mathbf{x}$ in $\mathcal{K}^n$ of radius r , and B_r will denote $B(0, r)$. Haar

¹Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 11J83, Secondary 11K60.

measure on $\mathcal{K}^n$ will be referred to as λ , normalised so that the measure of B_1 is 1. For a map $\mathbf{f} : U \subset \mathcal{K}^r \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$ and a ball $B \subset \mathcal{X}$, we will set $|\mathbf{f}|_B = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} |\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})|$.

1.2. Diophantine Approximation. Metric Diophantine approximation is primarily concerned with classifying points in a finite dimensional vector space over a field with regard to their approximation properties. The classification is done with respect to a measure, so a “typical” property is a property which holds or does not for almost every (hereafter abbreviated as a.e.) point with respect to the specified measure. For instance, one studies the set of v -approximable vectors,

Definition 1.1. $\mathcal{W}_v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}^n \mid |\mathbf{q}\mathbf{x} + p| < |\mathbf{q}|^{-v}, \text{ for infinitely many } \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{Z}^n \text{ and some } p \in \mathcal{Z}\}.$

And the set of *badly approximable* vectors,

Definition 1.2. $\mathcal{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}^n \mid \exists C > 0 \text{ such that } |p + \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x}| > \frac{C}{|\mathbf{q}|^n} \text{ for every } \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}, p \in \mathcal{Z}\}.$

It has been shown by Kristensen ([22], [23]) that whenever $v > n$, $\mathcal{W}_v$ is a null set of Hausdorff dimension $n - 1 + \frac{n+1}{v+1}$, and that $\mathcal{B}$ is a null set of full Hausdorff dimension. A vector which is v -approximable for some $v > n$ is said to be *very-well approximable* (abbreviated as VWA). More generally one can define *very well multiplicatively approximable* (VWMA) vectors as follows:

Definition 1.3. A vector $\mathbf{x}$ is VWMA if for some $\epsilon > 0$, there are infinitely many $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ such that

$$(1.1) \quad |p + \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x}| \leq \Pi_+(\mathbf{q})^{-1-\epsilon}$$

for some $p \in \mathcal{Z}$.

We now describe the set-up of Diophantine approximation with dependent quantities. A map $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n) : \mathcal{K}^r \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$ will be called *extremal* (resp. *strongly extremal*) if for λ a.e. $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ is not VWA (resp. VWMA). The theme of establishing extremality of maps began when Mahler ([24]) conjectured the extremality of $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ given by $\mathbf{f}(x) = (x, x^2, \dots, x^n)$.¹ Mahler’s conjecture was proved by Sprindžuk (cf. [31]). Let $\mathcal{X}$ denote a metric space, $\mathcal{F}$ a valued field and μ a Borel measure on $\mathcal{X}$. We will call a map $\mathbf{f} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^n$, non-planar at

¹The definitions of VWA and VWMA vectors over the field of real or p -adic numbers are analogous. The interested reader should consult one of the many references, for instance [7], [18], [20].

$x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ if for any neighborhood B of x_0 , the restrictions of $1, f_1, \dots, f_n$ are linearly independent over $\mathcal{F}$. Let us now take $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{R}$. The strong extremality of analytic non-planar $\mathbf{f}$ in this case was conjectured by Sprindžuk (conjecture $\mathbf{H}_2$, [32]). This conjecture was settled by D.Kleinbock and G.Margulis in [18], using newly developed tools from homogeneous dynamics. In fact, they relaxed the analyticity condition and replaced the non-planarity condition with an appropriate generalization called *nondegeneracy* (which we define precisely in section 3). See [15] for a nice survey of the problem. Sprindžuk's (and indeed Mahler's) conjectures can be formulated over other local fields. In [31], Sprindžuk proved Mahler's conjecture over the fields $\mathbb{Q}_p$ and $\mathcal{K}$. Following some partial results (see [20] for a brief historical survey), the methods of Kleinbock-Margulis were extended in [20] to settle the conjecture $\mathbf{H}_2$ over $\mathbb{Q}_p$. In fact, the following more general theorem is obtained by the authors.

Theorem 1.4. [20] *Let S be a finite set of valuations of $\mathbb{Q}$, for any $v \in S$ take $k_v, d_v \in \mathbb{N}$ and an open subset $U_v \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_v^{d_v}$, and let λ be the product of haar measures on $\mathbb{Q}_v^{d_v}$. Suppose that $\mathbf{f}$ is of the form $(\mathbf{f}^v)_{v \in S}$, where each $\mathbf{f}^v$ is a C^{k_v} map from U_v into $\mathbb{Q}_v^n$ which is nondegenerate at λ_v -a.e. point of U_v . Then $\mathbf{f}_* \lambda$ is strongly extremal.*

1.3. Main Result and Structure of this paper. In this paper, we establish the validity of Sprindžuk's conjecture $\mathbf{H}_2$ over a local field of characteristic $p > 0$. The structure of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we establish the link between Diophantine approximation and flows on homogeneous spaces, record a proof of Mahler's compactness criterion in characteristic p and provide an application (after Dani) to bounded trajectories on the space of lattices. Section 3 is devoted to a discussion of non-degenerate and good maps, culminating in a theorem from [20] which relates these notions. Finally, in section 4 we use the results from prior sections, as well as a modified version of a measure estimate from [20] to prove the main theorem of this paper, a special case of which is as follows.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $U \subset \mathcal{K}^d$ be an open set and $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n) : U \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$ be a C^l non-planar map. Then $\mathbf{f}$ is strongly extremal.*

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank his advisor Prof.Dmitry Kleinbock for guidance and for providing the preprint [20] which served as inspiration. Thanks are also due to Prof.Barak Weiss for helpful discussions.

2. REDUCTION TO A DYNAMICAL STATEMENT

2.1. Mahler's compactness criterion. It is well known that $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathcal{Z})$ is a non-uniform lattice in $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathcal{K})$ (c.f. [30]), which means that the space $\Omega_n = G_n/\Gamma_n$ is a non-compact space of finite volume. $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathcal{K})$ acts transitively on the space of unimodular (i.e. covolume 1) lattices in $\mathcal{K}^n$, and the stabilizer of $\mathcal{Z}^n$ is $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathcal{Z})$. Hence Ω_n can be identified with the space of unimodular lattices in $\mathcal{K}^n$. Let Λ be any (not-necessarily unimodular) lattice. Then $\det(\Lambda)$ will refer to $\det(g)$ where $g \in \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathcal{K})$ and Λ is of the form $g\mathcal{Z}^n$.

Following Mahler, we will call a real valued function F on $\mathcal{K}^n$ a distance function if it satisfies the following three conditions.

- (1) $F(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0 \forall \mathbf{x}$.
- (2) $F(t\mathbf{x}) = |t|F(\mathbf{x})$ for every $t \in \mathcal{K}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}^n$.
- (3) $F(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \leq \max(F(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{y}))$ for every $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{K}$.

The function $F(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{x}|$ is the prototype of a distance function. The structure of compact subsets of Ω_n is described by the Mahler Compactness Criterion which we will now state and prove. This is well known over the field of real numbers and a proof can be found for instance in [6]. We will need the following result from the geometry of numbers due to Mahler.

Theorem 2.1. [25] *Let F be a distance function on $\mathcal{K}^n$. There are n independent lattice points $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ with the following properties:*

- (1) $F(\mathbf{x}_1)$ is the minimum of $F(\mathbf{x})$ among all non-zero lattice points.
- (2) For $k \geq 2$, $F(\mathbf{x}_k)$ is the minimum of $F(\mathbf{x})$ among all lattice points which are independent of $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{k-1}$.
- (3) The determinant of the points $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ is 1.
- (4) $0 < F(\mathbf{x}_1) \leq \dots \leq F(\mathbf{x}_n)$ and

$$\prod_{i=1}^n F(\mathbf{x}_i) = 1$$

For our purposes, a trivial modification of the above theorem will be required which extends it to all lattices. Notice that the above theorem is actually a statement about the successive minima of B_1 with respect to the standard lattice. To restate the theorem for an arbitrary lattice $\Lambda = g\mathcal{Z}^n$, $g \in \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathcal{K})$ one needs to instead consider the successive

minima of the set $g^{-1}B_1$ with respect to the standard lattice. Thus we get the following corollary of theorem 2.1:

Corollary 2.2. *Any n -dimensional lattice Λ has a basis $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ such that*

$$\prod_{i=1}^n |\mathbf{x}_i| \leq |\det(\Lambda)|$$

A subset Q of Ω_n is said to be separated from 0, if there exists a non-empty neighborhood B of 0 in $\mathcal{K}^n$ such that $\Lambda \cap B = \{0\}$ for any lattice Λ in Q . The following is the positive characteristic version of Mahler's compactness criterion.

Theorem 2.3. *A subset Q of Ω_n is bounded if and only if it is separated from 0.*

Proof. We omit the implication $(\Rightarrow)$, as it is elementary and identical to the classical case. For the converse, notice that by corollary 2.2, we know that any lattice Λ in Q has a basis $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad \prod_{i=1}^n |\mathbf{a}_i| \leq 1$$

Then, since the vectors $\mathbf{a}_i$ are also bounded away from the origin by assumption, it follows that the norms of the vectors $\mathbf{a}_i$ are uniformly bounded from above. We now apply the Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem to finish the proof. $\square$

We get the following immediate:

Corollary 2.4. *The set*

$$Q_\epsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\Lambda \in \Omega_n \mid |\mathbf{x}| \geq \epsilon \ \forall \ \mathbf{x} \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}\}$$

is compact for every $\epsilon > 0$.

2.2. Dynamics and Diophantine Approximation. In order to state Diophantine properties of vectors in dynamical language, we need some notation. Let $\mathbf{f}$ be a map from an open subset of $\mathcal{K}^d$ to $\mathcal{K}^n$, and let $u_{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}$ denote the matrix

$$(2.2) \quad u_{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})^t \\ 0 & I_n \end{pmatrix}$$

and let $\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}$ denote the lattice $u_{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}$. In particular, if $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$, we will denote the lattice by $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$. Let $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ and set

$t = \sum_{i=1}^n t_i$, we consider the action on $\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}$ by semisimple elements of the form

$$(2.3) \quad g_{\mathbf{t}} = \text{diag}(X^t, X^{-t_1}, \dots, X^{-t_n}).$$

Define a function on the space Ω_n in the following manner:

$$(2.4) \quad \delta(\Lambda) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\mathbf{v} \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}} |\mathbf{v}|.$$

The following theorem establishes a link between orbits on the space of lattices and Diophantine properties of vectors.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\epsilon > 0$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $(p, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{Z}^{n+1}$ be such that 1.1 holds. Denote $\Pi_+(\mathbf{q})$ by k^m and define*

$$(2.5) \quad r = k^{-[\frac{m\epsilon}{n+1}]}.$$

Choose $t_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ to satisfy $|q_i|_+ = rk^{t_i}$. Then, $\delta(g_{\mathbf{t}}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}) \leq r$.

Proof. We need to prove the inequalities:

$$(2.6) \quad k^t |p + \mathbf{q} \cdot y| \leq r$$

and

$$(2.7) \quad k^{-t_i} |q_i| \leq r \quad \forall i.$$

The second follows immediately from the fact that $|q_i| \leq |\mathbf{q}|$ and the definition of t_i . As for the first, assume that 1.3 holds. Then, we have

$$|\mathbf{q} \cdot y + p| \leq \Pi_+(\mathbf{q})^{-1-\epsilon}.$$

Since $\Pi_+(\mathbf{q}) = r^n k^t$, it follows that

$$k^t |\mathbf{q} \cdot y + p| \leq r^{-n} \Pi_+(\mathbf{q})^{-\epsilon}$$

Since $k^{\frac{m\epsilon}{n+1}} \geq k^{[\frac{m\epsilon}{n+1}]}$, we see that $k^{-m\epsilon} \leq k^{-[\frac{m\epsilon}{n+1}](n+1)}$ which implies that $\Pi_+(\mathbf{q})^{-\epsilon} \leq r^{n+1}$. Thus,

$$k^t |\mathbf{q} \cdot y + p| \leq r^{-n} r^{n+1}.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Writing $r = k^{-\gamma}$ for a suitably chosen γ allows us to derive the following:

Corollary 2.6. *Assume that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}^n$ is VWMA. Then there exists $\gamma > 0$ and infinitely many $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ such that*

$$\delta(g_{\mathbf{t}}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}) \leq k^{-\gamma t}.$$

Proof. By theorem 2.5, and for γ as above, we can find an unbounded sequence $\mathbf{t}_k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\delta(g_{\mathbf{t}_k}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}) \leq k^{-\gamma t_k}$. $\square$

Consequently, to show that a map $\mathbf{f} : U \subset \mathcal{K}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$ is strongly extremal, it is enough to show that any non-degenerate point has a neighborhood $B \subseteq U$ such that for a.e. point in the neighborhood and any $\gamma > 0$, there are at most finitely many $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ such that

$$(2.8) \quad \delta(g_{\mathbf{t}}\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}) \leq k^{-\gamma t}$$

For then, if we fix $\mathbf{t}$ and define the set

$$(2.9) \quad E_{\mathbf{t}} = \{\mathbf{x} \in B \mid \delta(g_{\mathbf{t}}\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}) \leq k^{-\gamma t}\}$$

theorem 1.5 will follow from an application of the Borel-Cantelli lemma if we are able to show that

Lemma 2.7.

$$\sum_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n} \lambda(E_{\mathbf{t}}) < \infty.$$

Lemma 2.7 will be an easy consequence of the following theorem which will then complete the proof of theorem 1.5.

Theorem 2.8. *Let $\mathbf{f}$ be a C^l map from an open subset $U \subset \mathcal{K}^d$ to $\mathcal{K}^n$, and assume that $\mathbf{f}$ is nondegenerate at $\mathbf{x}_0 \in U$. Then there exists a ball $B(\mathbf{x}_0, r) \subset U$ and positive constants C, ρ such that for any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, any $s > 0$ and $0 < \epsilon \leq \rho$ one has*

$$\lambda(\{\mathbf{x} \in B \mid \delta(g_{\mathbf{t}}\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}) < \epsilon\}) \leq (n+1)C \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\rho}\right)^\alpha \lambda(B)$$

2.3. Bounded trajectories. Let us digress a bit to provide an application of theorem 2.3. This result is originally due to Dani [8] who established it over the field of real numbers. For $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$(2.10) \quad g_t = \text{diag}(X^{nt}, X^{-t}, \dots, X^{-t}).$$

Theorem 2.9. *The trajectory $\{g_t\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \mid t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is bounded if and only if $\mathbf{x}$ is badly approximable.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathbf{x}$ is badly approximable and choose δ so that

$$(2.11) \quad C^{\frac{1}{n+1}} > \delta > 0$$

where C is the constant in definition 1.2. Let $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{Z}^{n+1}$ be such that $g_{t'}u_{\mathbf{x}}\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in B_\delta$ for some $t' \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Keeping in mind that $|X| = k$, we have

$$(2.12) \quad k^{nt'} |\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \cdot (1, \mathbf{x})| \leq \delta$$

and

$$(2.13) \quad k^{-t'} |\mathbf{y}| \leq \delta.$$

From definition 1.2, and equations 2.12 and 2.13 it follows that

$$\frac{C}{\delta^n k^{nt'}} \leq \frac{C}{|\mathbf{y}|^n} < |\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \cdot (1, \mathbf{x})| \leq \frac{\delta}{k^{nt'}}$$

which cannot happen in view of equation 2.11. Hence, $g_t \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \cap B_\delta = \{0\}$ and by corollary 2.4, the trajectory is bounded.

For the converse, by theorem 2.3, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $|g_t u_{\mathbf{x}} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}| > \delta$ for every $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{Z}^{n+1}$. This implies that for every $t \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$(2.14) \quad k^{nt} |\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \cdot (1, \mathbf{x})| > \delta$$

and

$$(2.15) \quad k^{-t} |\mathbf{y}| > \delta$$

A choice of $C = \delta^{n+1}$ can now be seen to ensure that $\mathbf{x}$ is badly approximable. $\square$

One can now decompose $g \in \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathcal{K})$ into factors one of which is of the form 2.2 and then conclude (cf. proposition 2.12 in [8]) that

Lemma 2.10. *The trajectory $\{g_t g \mathcal{Z}^{n+1} \mid t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is bounded if and only if $\{g_t \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \mid t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is bounded.*

As a corollary of theorem 2.9, lemma 2.10 and the main result in [23], it follows that

Corollary 2.11. *The set*

$$Bdd_{n+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\Lambda \in \Omega_{n+1} \mid \{g_t \Lambda\} \text{ is a bounded trajectory}\}$$

has full Hausdorff dimension.

To put corollary 2.11 in context, we remark that in case $G = \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{R})$ and $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{Z})$, the action of a one-parameter subgroup g_t not contained in a compact subgroup of G , on G/Γ is ergodic (a special case of Moore's ergodicity theorem cf.[35]). This implies that the set of bounded g_t orbits is a null set (with respect to the $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ -invariant measure on G/Γ). The Kleinbock-Margulis bounded orbit theorem (cf. [19]) is a vast generalization of the ‘‘ampleness’’ of bounded trajectories as above, to semisimple flows on general homogeneous spaces of real Lie groups. Over $\mathbb{Q}_p$, we know after Tamagawa that all lattices in $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Q}_p)$ are cocompact (cf.[30]) and so all orbits are necessarily bounded. Over $\mathcal{K}$, the ergodicity of semisimple flows has been established by G.Prasad (cf.[27]) and implies that for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, Bdd_n has measure 0 (with respect to the $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathcal{K})$ -invariant measure on $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathcal{K})/\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathcal{Z})$).

3. ULTRAMETRIC NON-DEGENERATE AND GOOD MAPS

We will first define single variable C^n functions in the ultrametric case. Our definitions and treatment are from [29]. Let U be a non-empty subset of $\mathcal{K}$ without isolated points. For $n \in \mathbf{N}$, define

Definition 3.1.

$$\nabla^n(U) = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in U, x_i \neq x_j \text{ for } i \neq j\}$$

The n -th order difference quotient of a function $f : U \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ is the function $\Phi_n(f)$ defined inductively by $\Phi_0(f) = f$ and, for $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) \in \nabla^n(U)$ by

$$\Phi_n f(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) = \frac{\Phi_{n-1} f(x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{n+1}) - \Phi_{n-1} f(x_2, \dots, x_{n+1})}{x_1 - x_2}.$$

Note that the definition does not depend on the choice of variables, as all difference quotients are symmetric functions. A function f on $\mathcal{K}$ is called a C^n function if $\Phi_n f$ can be extended to a continuous function $\bar{\Phi}_n f : U^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$. We also define

$$D_n f(a) = \bar{\Phi}_n f(a, \dots, a), \quad a \in U$$

We then have the following theorem (c.f. [29], Theorem 29.5)

Theorem 3.2. *Let $f \in C^n(U \rightarrow \mathcal{K})$. Then, f is n times differentiable and*

$$j! D_j f = f^j$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq n$.

An immediate corollary shows us why we must exercise a little caution in positive characteristic:

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\text{char}(K) = p$ and $f \in C^p(U \rightarrow \mathcal{K})$. Then $f^p = 0$.*

To define C^k functions in several variables, a generalization of the above notion is required. We will follow the notation set forth in [20]. Namely, we now consider a multiindex $\beta = (i_1, \dots, i_d)$ and let

$$\Phi_\beta f = \Phi_1^{i_1} \circ \dots \circ \Phi_d^{i_d} f$$

This difference order quotient is defined on the set $\nabla^{i_1} U_1 \times \dots \times \nabla^{i_d} U_d$ and the U_i are all non-empty subsets of $\mathcal{K}$ without isolated points. A function f will then be said to belong to $C^k(U_1 \times \dots \times U_d)$ if for any multiindex β with $|\beta| = \sum_{j=1}^d i_j \leq k$, $\Phi_\beta f$ extends to a continuous function $\bar{\Phi}_\beta f : U_1^{i_1+1} \times \dots \times U_d^{i_d+1}$. As in the one variable case, we have

$$(3.1) \quad \partial_\beta f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \beta! \bar{\Phi}_\beta f(x_1, \dots, x_1, \dots, x_d, \dots, x_d)$$

where $\beta! = \prod_{j=1}^d i_j!$.

We now wish to define non-degenerate functions in our situation. Over the field of real numbers, a function is said to be non-degenerate if the target space is spanned by the partial derivatives of the function. We will have to modify this slightly in view of corollary 3.3. Let $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ be a C^m map from $U \subset \mathcal{K}^d$ to $\mathcal{K}^n$. For $l \leq m$, we will say that a point $y = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ is l non-degenerate if the space $\mathcal{K}^n$ is spanned by the difference quotients $\bar{\Phi}_\beta$ of $\mathbf{f}$ at x with $|\beta| \leq l$. For analytic functions, it follows that the linear independence of $1, f_1, \dots, f_n$ is equivalent to all points of $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ being non-degenerate. We would also like to remark that for one variable, the definition of non-degeneracy does not correspond to the non-vanishing of the Wronskian. This is in contrast to the real variable case.

It follows easily that $\mathbf{f}$ is k non-degenerate at $\mathbf{x}_0$ if and only if for any function f of the form $f = c_0 + \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{f}$, where $c_0 \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{K}$ there exists a multiindex β such that $|\beta| \leq k$ and $\bar{\Phi}_\beta \neq 0$.

Before proceeding, we define an important class of functions. Let $\mathcal{X}$ denote a metric space, μ a locally finite Borel measure on $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ a locally compact field. For a ball $B \subset \mathcal{X}$, and a map $\mathbf{f} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ we set $|\mathbf{f}|_{B, \mu} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\mathbf{f}|_{B \cap \text{supp } \mu}$.

Definition 3.4. Let C and α be positive numbers and $V \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. A function $f : V \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is said to be (C, α) -good on V with respect to μ if for any open ball $B \subseteq V$, and for any $\epsilon > 0$, one has :

$$\mu \left(\left\{ \mathbf{v} \in B \mid |f(\mathbf{v})| < \epsilon \cdot |f(\mathbf{v})|_{B, \mu} \right\} \right) \leq C \epsilon^\alpha \mu(B).$$

We will be mostly concerned with the case when $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{K}^d$ for some d . In this case, we will assume that μ is the normalized Haar measure λ and simply refer to the map as (C, α) -good. Some easy properties of (C, α) -good functions are :

- (1) f is (C, α) -good on $V \Rightarrow$ so is $cf \ \forall c \in \mathcal{K}$. (Here $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{K}$).
- (2) $f_i \ i \in I$ are (C, α) -good $\Rightarrow$ so is $\sup_{i \in I} |f_i|$. (Here $\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{R}$).

Polynomials provide good examples of (C, α) -good functions. In fact, we have the following lemma from [33].

Lemma 3.5. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an ultrametric valued field. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, any polynomial $f \in \mathcal{F}[x]$ of degree not greater than k is $(C, 1/k)$ -good on $\mathcal{F}$, where C is a constant depending on k alone.

More generally, we will call a map $\mathbf{f} : U \subset \mathcal{K}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$ *good* at $\mathbf{x}_0 \in U$ if there exists a neighborhood $V \subset U$ of $\mathbf{x}_0$ and positive C, α such that any linear combination of $1, f_1, \dots, f_n$ is (C, α) good on V . We now state Proposition 4.2 from [20] which shows that non-degenerate functions are good.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an ultrametric valued field and let $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ be a C^l map from an open subset $U \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ to $\mathcal{F}^n$ which is l -non-degenerate at $\mathbf{x}_0 \in U$. Then there is a neighborhood $V \subset U$ of $\mathbf{x}_0$ such that any linear combination of $1, f_1, \dots, f_n$ is $(dl^{3-\frac{1}{l}}, \frac{1}{dl})$ -good on V . In particular, the nondegeneracy of $\mathbf{f}$ at $\mathbf{x}_0$ implies that $\mathbf{f}$ is good at $\mathbf{x}_0$.*

4. QUANTITATIVE NON-DIVERGENCE AND APPLICATIONS

In this section, our aim is to establish theorem 1.5. We first will need some notation. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be an integral domain, K its quotient field, and $\mathcal{R}$ denote a field containing K as a subfield. If Δ is a $\mathcal{D}$ -submodule of $\mathcal{R}^m$, we will denote by $\mathcal{R}\Delta$ its $\mathcal{R}$ -linear span inside $\mathcal{R}^m$, and define the rank of Δ to be

$$(4.1) \quad rk(\Delta) = \dim_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{R}\Delta)$$

If $\Delta \subset \Lambda$ and Λ is also an $\mathcal{D}$ -submodule, we will say that Δ is primitive in Λ if any submodule of Λ of rank equal to $rk(\Delta)$ which contains Δ is equal to Δ . and we will call Δ primitive if it is primitive in $\mathcal{D}^m$. It follows from Lemma 6.2 in [20] that Δ is primitive if and only if

$$\Delta = \mathcal{R}\Delta \cap \mathcal{D}^m.$$

We also define

$$(4.2) \quad \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{D}, m) = \text{the set of nonzero primitive submodules of } \mathcal{D}^m.$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, m) = \{g\Delta \mid g \in \text{GL}(m, \mathcal{R}), \Delta \text{ is a submodule of } \mathcal{D}^m.\}$$

Note that $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{D}, m)$ is a poset ordered by inclusion of length m . Moreover we have,

Lemma 4.1. *Let Γ be a discrete $\mathcal{Z}$ -submodule of $\mathcal{K}^m$. Then*

$$(4.4) \quad \Gamma = \mathcal{Z}\mathbf{x}_1 + \dots + \mathcal{Z}\mathbf{x}_k$$

where $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$ are linearly independent over $\mathcal{K}$. In particular, Γ is free and finitely generated.

Proof. Since $\Gamma \subset \mathcal{K}^m$, we can take a maximal linearly independent (over $\mathcal{K}$) set $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k\}$ of vectors. Let Γ' denote the free $\mathcal{Z}$ -module $\mathcal{Z}\mathbf{v}_1 + \dots + \mathcal{Z}\mathbf{v}_k$. Clearly, Γ' is a $\mathcal{Z}$ -submodule of Γ . Moreover, Γ/Γ' is a discrete subset of the compact space $(\mathcal{K}\mathbf{v}_1 + \dots + \mathcal{K}\mathbf{v}_k)/\Gamma'$, and is consequently finite. Thus Γ' has finite index in Γ and so Γ is a free $\mathcal{Z}$ -module of rank k . The existence and linear independence of the basis follows. $\square$

Consequently, $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, m)$ can be identified with the set of discrete $\mathcal{Z}$ -submodules of $\mathcal{K}^m$. We now wish to measure the size of such submodules. Let $\nu : \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, m) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a function. Following [20], we will call ν norm-like if the following three conditions are satisfied:

- N1 For any $\Delta, \Delta' \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, m)$, with $\Delta' \subset \Delta$ and $rk(\Delta) = rk(\Delta')$, one has $\nu(\Delta') \geq \nu(\Delta)$.
- N2 There exists $C_\nu > 0$ such that for any $\Delta \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, m)$ and any $\gamma \notin \mathcal{R}\Delta$ one has $\nu(\Delta + \mathcal{D}\gamma) \leq C_\nu \nu(\Delta) \nu(\mathcal{D}\gamma)$.
- N3 For every submodule Δ of $\mathcal{D}^m$, the function $\text{GL}(m, \mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $g \rightarrow \nu(g\Delta)$ is continuous.

The following theorem is an ultrametric version of theorem 6.3 in [20]. The proof of the theorem is to a large extent identical to that in [20], or [18]. Rather than reproduce it, we point out the differences in the statement and provide the reader with justifications.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a separable ultrametric space, μ denote a locally finite Borel measure on $\mathcal{X}$, and let $\mathcal{D} \subset K \subset \mathcal{R}$ be as above. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let a ball $B = B(\mathbf{x}_0, r_0) \subset \mathcal{X}$ and a continuous map $h : B \rightarrow \text{GL}(m, \mathcal{R})$ be given. Let ν be a norm-like function on $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, m)$. For any $\Delta \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{D}, m)$, denote by ψ_Δ the function $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \nu(h(\mathbf{x})\Delta)$ on B . Now suppose that for some $C, \alpha > 0$ and $0 < \rho < \frac{1}{C_\nu}$, the following three conditions are satisfied.*

- (1) *For every $\Delta \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{D}, m)$, the function ψ_Δ is (C, α) -good on B .*
- (2) *For every $\Delta \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{D}, m)$, $|\psi_\Delta|_B, \mu \geq \rho$.*
- (3) *For every $\mathbf{x} \in B \cap \text{supp } \mu$, $\#\{\Delta \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{D}, m) \mid \psi_\Delta(\mathbf{x}) < \rho\} < \infty$.*

Then for any positive $\epsilon \leq \rho$ one has

$$\mu \left(\left\{ \mathbf{x} \in B \mid \begin{array}{l} \nu(h(\mathbf{x})\gamma) < \epsilon \text{ for} \\ \text{some } \gamma \in \mathcal{D}^m \setminus \{0\} \end{array} \right\} \right) \leq mC \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\rho} \right)^\alpha \mu(B).$$

Theorem 6.3 in [20] differs from the above statement in two ways. Firstly, the domain of the map h above is a dilate of B , namely it is $B(\mathbf{x}_0, 3^m r_0)$. Secondly, it is proven for the class of *Federer* measures (see below), a restriction we no longer need. This rids the estimate of a constant. We elaborate on these below.

Dilation of balls: The proof of theorem 4.2 is based on a delicate induction argument. Essentially, a notion of “marked” points is introduced and it is established that the set of unmarked points has small measure. In the induction step, a collection of balls with centers inside B is taken. However, these balls need not be contained in B , and therefore, one needs to dilate the ball B and introduce a constraint on the measure μ so as to ensure that it behaves well with respect to dilations. This is the so-called *Federer* condition and it introduces an additional constant in the above estimate. However, in the case that $\mathcal{X}$ is ultrametric, each of the above balls must be contained in B . Therefore we do not need to dilate the ball and restrict ourselves to Federer measures.

Besicovitch constant: The subsequent strategy is to cover the dilated ball B and choose a countable sub-covering with some multiplicity (depending on $\mathcal{X}$). The fact that this can be done is the content of the Besicovitch covering theorem (cf. [18] and the references therein). This introduces a constant (a power of the multiplicity) in the above estimate. For separable ultrametric spaces, as can be easily verified a subcovering with multiplicity one suffices.

To apply the above theorem, we take $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{Z}$, and $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{K}$. Let $\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_m$ denote the standard basis of $\mathcal{K}^m$. Let $\mathbf{e}_I = \mathbf{e}_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{e}_{i_m}$ where $I = (i_1, \dots, i_m)$. We extend this norm to the exterior algebra of $\mathcal{K}^m$. Namely, for $\mathbf{w} = \sum_I w_I \mathbf{e}_I$, we set $|\mathbf{w}| = \max_I |w_I|$. Since Γ is a finitely generated free $\mathcal{Z}$ -module, we can choose a basis $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r$ (where r is the rank of Γ as a $\mathcal{Z}$ -module) of Γ and define

$$(4.5) \quad |\Gamma| = |\mathbf{v}_1 \wedge \mathbf{v}_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{v}_r|$$

Note that Γ is a lattice in $\mathcal{K}\Gamma$ and that the vectors $\mathbf{v}_i$ generate this space. Moreover, it turns out that

Lemma 4.3. *The function $|\cdot|$ is norm like on $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{Z}, m)$.*

Proof. Property N3 is a consequence of the definition. To prove N2, we take $\mathbf{w}$ representing Δ , and $C_\nu = 1$. Then $\mathbf{w}, \gamma$ is a basis for $\Delta + \mathcal{Z}\gamma$

and so it suffices to prove that $|\mathbf{w} \wedge \gamma| \leq |\mathbf{w}| |\gamma|$. Let $\mathbf{w} = \sum_I w_I \mathbf{e}_I$ and $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i \mathbf{e}_i$. Then

$$|\mathbf{w} \wedge \gamma| \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \max_I |w_I \gamma_i| \leq \max_I |w_I| \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} |\gamma_i| = |\mathbf{w}| |\gamma|.$$

It is also straightforward to verify the veracity of N1. $\square$

We thus have:

Theorem 4.4. *Let $m, d \in \mathbb{N}$, $C, \alpha > 0$ and $0 < \rho < 1$ be given. Let a ball $B = B(\mathbf{x}_0, r_0) \subset \mathcal{K}^d$ and a continuous map $h : B \rightarrow \text{GL}(m, \mathcal{K})$ be given. For any $\Delta \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{Z}, m)$, let $\psi_\Delta(\mathbf{x}) = |h(\mathbf{x})\Delta|$, $\mathbf{x} \in B$. Assume that*

- (1) *For every $\Delta \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{Z}, m)$, the function ψ_Δ is (C, α) -good on B .*
- (2) *For every $\Delta \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{Z}, m)$, $|\psi_\Delta|_B \geq \rho$.*
- (3) *For every $\mathbf{x} \in B$, $\#\{\Delta \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{Z}, m) \mid \psi_\Delta(\mathbf{x}) < \rho\} < \infty$.*

Then for any positive $\epsilon \leq \rho$ one has

$$\lambda(\{x \in B \mid \delta(h(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{Z}^m) < \epsilon\}) \leq mC \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\rho}\right)^\alpha \lambda(B).$$

Proof. We apply theorem 4.2. Lemma 4.3 guarantees the norm-like behavior of $|\cdot|$ whereas condition (3) follows from the discreteness of $\bigwedge^r(\mathcal{Z}^m)$ in $\bigwedge^r(\mathcal{K}^m)$. Further, if $\delta(h(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{Z}^m) < \epsilon$ then there exists a non-zero vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{Z}^m$ such that $|h(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{w}| < \epsilon$. $\square$

We now complete the proof of theorem 2.8 using:

Theorem 4.5. *Let $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ be a C^l map from a ball $B \subset \mathcal{K}^d$ to $\mathcal{K}^n$ which satisfies the following two conditions:*

- (1) *For any $\mathbf{c} = (c_0, \dots, c_n) \in \mathcal{K}^{n+1}$, $c_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i$ is (C, α) -good on B .*
- (2) *For any $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $|\mathbf{c}| \geq 1$,*

$$|c_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i|_B \geq \rho$$

Take any $\epsilon \leq \rho$ and set $h(\mathbf{x}) = g_{\mathbf{t}} u_{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}$. Then,

$$\lambda(\{\mathbf{x} \in B \mid \delta(h(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}) < \epsilon\}) \leq (n+1)C \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\rho}\right)^\alpha \lambda(B)$$

Proof. Let us begin by describing the action of $h(\mathbf{x})$ on $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{D}, m)$. To do this, we fix a basis (the standard one) $\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$ of $\mathcal{K}^{n+1}$. We now take a submodule $\Gamma \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{D}, m)$, and an element $\mathbf{w} \in \bigwedge^r(\mathcal{K}^{n+1})$ of the form $\mathbf{w} = \sum_I w_I \mathbf{e}_I$ representing Γ . Then,

$$u_{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}\mathbf{w} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_I & 0 \in I \\ \mathbf{e}_I + \sum_{i \in I} \pm f_i(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{e}_{I \cup \{0\} \setminus \{i\}} & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

and so we have

$$u_{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}\mathbf{w} = \sum_{0 \notin I} w_I \mathbf{e}_I + \sum_{0 \in I} \left(w_I + \sum_{i \notin I} \pm w_{I \cup \{i\} \setminus \{0\}} f_i(\mathbf{x}) \right) \mathbf{e}_I$$

If we now apply $g_{\mathbf{t}}$ to both sides of the above equation, we get $h(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{w} = \sum_I h_I(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{e}_I$ where

$$h_I(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} (\prod_{i \in I} k^{-i}) w_I & 0 \notin I \\ (\prod_{i \notin I} k^i) (w_I + \sum_{i \notin I} \pm w_{I \cup \{i\} \setminus \{0\}} f_i(\mathbf{x})) & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Hence, all the coordinates of $h_I(\mathbf{x})$ are of the form $c_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i(\mathbf{x})$ for some $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{K}^{n+1}$. By assumption 1, any such combination is (C, α) -good on $\tilde{B}$. Then, by property 2 following definition 3.4, we have that $\sup_I h_I$ is (C, α) -good as well. Moreover, since $w_I \in \mathcal{Z}$ for each I , and at least one of them is non-zero, we can conclude that there exists I containing 0 such that $h_I(\mathbf{x}) = c_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i(\mathbf{x})$ and $|\mathbf{c}| \geq 1$ which implies that $|h_I|_B \geq \rho$. If we now define $\psi_{\Gamma}(\mathbf{x}) = |h(\mathbf{x})\Gamma|$, this means that $|\psi_{\Gamma}|_B \geq \rho$. Now an application of theorem 4.4 completes the proof. $\square$

We now proceed to a proof of theorem 2.8 using theorem 4.5. Take $U \subset \mathcal{K}^d$, $\mathbf{f} : U \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$, and $\mathbf{x}_0 \in U$. Using proposition 3.6, we can find a neighborhood $V \subseteq U$ of $\mathbf{x}_0$ such that any linear combination of $1, f_1, \dots, f_n$ is $(dl^{3-\frac{1}{t}}, \frac{1}{dl})$ -good on V . Choose a ball $B = B(\mathbf{x}_0, r) \subset V$. Then $\mathbf{f}$ and B will satisfy condition 1 of theorem 4.5. As for condition 2, it is an immediate consequence of the linear independence of $1, f_1, \dots, f_n$ over $\mathcal{K}$. Thus, an application of theorem 4.5 completes the proof.

Thus, it follows that for any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, $\lambda(E_{\mathbf{t}}) \leq dl^{3-\frac{1}{t}} \left(\frac{k^{-\gamma}}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{1}{dl}}$ and so, $\sum_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n} \lambda(E_{\mathbf{t}}) \leq \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{t}, t=q} k^{-q\gamma/dl} \asymp \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} q^n k^{-q\gamma/dl}$ which converges. This immediately implies lemma 2.7 thus completing the proof of Theorem 1.5.

5. DYNAMICAL APPLICATIONS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

5.1. Dynamical Applications. We now proceed to applications of a dynamical nature. Following work of G.Margulis [26], it has been known that orbits of unipotent flows on $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ are non-divergent. This was extended by S.G.Dani (cf. [9] and the references therein) in several important ways. Specifically, given a lattice Λ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and any unipotent flow $\{u_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$, it was shown that one can find a compact $K \subset \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $u_t\Lambda$ spends most of its time in this compact set and a quantitative estimate on this time was obtained. Secondly, it was shown that under suitable conditions (i.e. unless the orbit of a lattice is contained in a proper closed subset), one could pick a compact set which works for any lattice, and these results were extended to general semi-simple Lie groups and their lattices. In [18], the authors obtain a quantitative improvement of Dani's result (for the case $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$) and in [20], these results were extended to the S -arithmetic case. The question of establishing unipotent non-divergence in characteristic p was raised by S.G.Dani in [10]. Using theorem 4.4 and 2.3 it is possible to answer this question for $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathcal{K})/\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathcal{Z})$. Specifically it can be shown that,

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\Lambda \in \Omega_n$ be any lattice. Then there exist positive constants $C = C(n)$ and $\rho = \rho(\Lambda)$ such that for any one-parameter subgroup $\{u_t\}$ of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathcal{K})$, for any ball $B \subset \mathcal{K}$ containing 0, and any $\epsilon \leq \rho$, we have*

$$(5.1) \quad \mu(\{t \in B \mid \delta(u_t\Lambda) < \epsilon\}) \leq C \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{1}{n^2}} \mu(B).$$

The proof will follow in a sequel [12] where we will also establish more general non-divergence results for G/Γ where G is the group of $\mathcal{K}$ -points of a semi-simple algebraic group defined over $\mathcal{K}$ and Γ is a lattice in G .

5.2. More on Diophantine Approximation. One can ask questions in a more general framework as introduced in [17] (see also [28]). Namely, one can study Diophantine properties of points with respect to measures, and show that a large class of measures (including measures supported on fractal subsets of $\mathcal{K}^r$) are strongly extremal. Definitions and details will appear in the author's PhD. thesis. One can also seek to extend the results in this paper as well as [20] and obtain Khintchine-type theorems over ultrametric fields (cf. [5], [3], [1] for the real variable case, [2], [4], [21] for results over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ and [14], [11] for results over $\mathcal{K}$).

Finally, following [16] (see also [13]), it would be interesting to study Diophantine properties of affine subspaces over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ and $\mathcal{K}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] V.Beresnevich, *A Groshev type theorem for convergence on manifolds*, Acta Math Hungar. 94 (2002), No.1 – 2, 99 – 130.
- [2] V.Beresnevich, V.Bernik and E.Kovalevskaya, *On approximation of p -adic numbers by p -adic algebraic numbers*, J.Number Theory, 111, (2005), No.1, 33 – 56.
- [3] V.Beresnevich, V.Bernik, D.Kleinbock and G.A.Margulis, *Metric Diophantine Approximation: the Khintchine-Groshev theorem for nondegenerate manifolds. Dedicated to Yuri.I.Manin on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, Moscow Math. Journal2 (2002), No.2, 203 – 225.
- [4] V.Beresnevich and E.Kovalevskaya, *On Diophantine approximations of dependent quantities in the p -adic case*, (Russian) Mat.Zametki, 73 (2003). No.1 – 2, 21 – 35.
- [5] V.Bernik, D.Kleinbock and G.A.Margulis, *Khintchine type theorems on manifolds : the convergence case for the standard and multiplicative versions*, Internat.Math.Res.Notices (2001), No.9, 453 – 486.
- [6] M. Bachir Bekka and Matthias Mayer, *Ergodic Theory and Topological Dynamics of Group Actions on Homogeneous Spaces*, Cambridge University Press (2000).
- [7] J.W.S. Cassels, *An introduction to Diophantine Approximation*, Cambridge tracts in Mathematics.vol 45.Cambridge Univ.Press, Cambridge, (1957).
- [8] S.G.Dani, *Divergent trajectories of flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine Approximation*, J.Reine Angew.Math 360 (1985), 214.
- [9] S.G.Dani, *On orbits of unipotent flows on homogeneous spaces*,2. Ergodic Theory Dynamical systems 6 (1986), 167 – 182.
- [10] S.G.Dani, *Continuous equivariant images of lattice-actions on boundaries*, Ann. Math., 119 (1984), 111 – 119.
- [11] M. M. Dodson, S. Kristensen and J. Levesley, *A quantitative Khintchine-Groshev type theorem over a field of formal series*, to appear in Indag. Math. (N.S.).
- [12] Anish Ghosh, *Orbits of unipotent flows in finite characteristic*, In preparation.

- [13] Anish Ghosh, *A Khintchine-type theorem for hyperplanes*, J.London Math.Soc. *To appear*.
- [14] Kae Inoue and Hitoshi Nakada, *On metric Diophantine approximation in positive characteristic*, Acta Arith. 110 (2003), no.3, 205 – 218.
- [15] D.Kleinbock, *Some applications of homogeneous dynamics to number theory*, Smooth ergodic theory and its applications, Proc.Sympos.Pure.Math.69, AMS, Providence RI, (2001), 639 – 660.
- [16] D.Kleinbock, *Extremal subspaces and their submanifolds*, Geom.Funct.Anal 13, (2003), no 2 437 – 466.
- [17] D.Kleinbock, E.Lindenstrauss and B.Weiss, *On Fractal Measures and Diophantine Approximation*, Selecta Math. *To appear*.
- [18] D.Kleinbock and G.A.Margulis, *Flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine Approximation on Manifolds*, Ann. Math., 148 (1998), 339 – 360.
- [19] D.Kleinbock and G.A.Margulis, *Bounded orbits of nonquasiunipotent flows on homogeneous spaces*, Amer.Math.Soc.Transl. 171 (1996), 141 – 172.
- [20] D.Kleinbock and G.Tomanov, *Flows on S -arithmetic homogeneous spaces and applications to metric Diophantine Approximation*, Preprint, <http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/math.NT/0506510>.
- [21] E.Kovalevskaya, *p -adic variant of the convergence Khintchine theorem for curves over $\mathbb{Z}_p$* , Acta Math. Inform. Univ. Ostraviensis 10 (2002), No. 1, 71 – 78.
- [22] Simon Kristensen, *On well approximable matrices over a field of formal series*, Math.Proc.Camb.Phil.Soc. (2003), 135(2), 255 – 268.
- [23] Simon Kristensen, *Badly Approximable systems of linear forms over a field of formal series*, Preprint.
- [24] K.Mahler, *Über das Mass der Menge aller S -Zahlen*, Math Ann. 106, 1932, 131 – 139.
- [25] Kurt Mahler, *An analogue to Minkowski's Geometry of numbers in a field of series*, Ann.Math., 2nd Ser.1941, Vol.42, No.2. 488 – 522.
- [26] G.A.Margulis, *On the action of unipotent group in the space of lattices*, Proceedings of the Summer School on group representations, (Budapest 1971), Académiai Kiado, Budapest, (1975), 365 – 370.
- [27] G.Prasad, *Strong approximation theorem for semi-simple groups over function fields*, Ann. Math., 105 (1977), 553 – 572.

- [28] A.Pollington and S.Velani, *Metric Diophantine Approximation and ‘absolutely friendly’ measures*, Preprint.
- [29] W.H.Schikhof, *Ultrametric Calculus, an introduction to p -adic analysis*, Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics, 4. Cambridge University Press, (1984).
- [30] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Arbres, Amalgames, SL_2* . Asterisque no.46, Soc.Math.France, (1977).
- [31] V.G.Sprindžhuk, *Mahler’s Problem in Metric Number theory* (Translated from the Russian by B.Volkman), Translations of Mathematical Monographs,AMS, Vol25, (1969).
- [32] V.G.Sprindžuk, *Achievements and problems in Diophantine Approximation theory*, Russian Math. Surveys 35 (1980), 1 – 80.
- [33] G.Tomanov, *Orbits on homogeneous spaces of arithmetic origin and approximations*, Advanced Studies in Pure Mathematics, 26 (2000), 265 – 297.
- [34] A.Weil, *Basic Number Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1995).
- [35] R.Zimmer, *Ergodic Theory and Semisimple Groups*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (1984).

Anish Ghosh
 MS 050, Brandeis University
 415 South Street
 Waltham, MA-02454
 U.S.A.
 ghosh@brandeis.edu